



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

on the papyri as יידי, the occurrence in one passage of the papyri and on many ostraca of ייהו, the Greek 'Ιαω, and such names as Jehonadab, Jehoshaphat. The pronunciation Yahweh does not rest upon good, old Hebrew tradition, but is a very late inference from the statement in Exod. 3:14.

These conclusions will not command general assent; but they are set forward with much cogency and will compel careful consideration. The argument as to the motif of the temple letters is perhaps most open to question. Why, for example, should a letter growing out of a difference of opinion, such as that alleged, be wholly silent upon the point at issue? We should expect a discussion of the pros and cons of the question, but there is not a word upon the subject. Instead, we hear of the wrongs done to the community and its shrine by the Persian official Widarnag; and the request made to Bagoas is that he give orders for the rebuilding of the temple, not that he merely state such an enterprise to be unobjectionable from the point of view of Palestinian usage. Furthermore, is not too much emphasis laid, both here and in many other discussions, upon the fact that Bagoas in his oral reply, of which a memorandum is preserved, does not mention animal sacrifices explicitly? True, he does not use the word; but this is only a brief memorandum and not necessarily intended to itemize the whole answer of Bagoas, and, likewise, it distinctly states that the temple is to be rebuilt as it was aforetime and that the offering of oblation and incense upon the altar is to go on as it was previously practiced. There is no indication given of any attempt to re-establish things upon a different basis from that in existence before the ruin of the temple. But whatever the judgment upon such questions as these, Professor Van Hoonacker has given us a stimulating and informing discussion of these materials, from which all scholars may learn much.

J. M. POWIS SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A HISTORY OF BABYLON¹

The second volume of King's great work presents the same characteristics as the first. We have the same unrivaled mastery of the original sources, the same painstaking investigation of the problems of the moment, the same ignoring of the earlier bibliography, and the same scrappy form of presentation.

¹ *A History of Babylon*. By L. W. King. New York: Stokes, 1915. xxiii+340 pages. \$4.80.

First we are given an "introductory" sketch of the various cities, from Babylon to Baghdad, which have occupied the strategic point where the Tigris and Euphrates come closest together. One wonders why this was not given in the first volume, for Kish and Agade were the predecessors of Babylon in exactly the same manner as Seleucia, Ctesiphon, and Baghdad were her successors, and the series should be studied as a whole. We may doubt whether the West Semitic origin of the first Babylonian dynasty caused Babylon to be located on the Euphrates when we remember that the still more western Macedonians moved the capital from Babylon to Seleucia on the Tigris.

The next chapter deals with the city of Babylon. Inasmuch as practically all our topographic and architectural knowledge concerns the city of Nebuchadnezzar, we should expect this chapter, together with the material on the cultural life of the period, at the end of the political history. The account is naturally based on Koldewey's *Babylon*, but is by no means a useless compilation. The detailed architectural account of Koldewey unfortunately lacks the charm of his personal conversation, and a topical arrangement is most welcome, especially as King writes from personal knowledge of the excavations. In certain cases he is even able to overcome the natural prejudice in favor of the theories set forth by the excavator. The discussion of the walls is a distinct contribution, and Koldewey's identification of the hanging gardens is almost certainly thrown out of court by King's acute observation that the tablets show grain to have been stored in the vaults, an impossibility if there were irrigated gardens above them. One is, however, surprised to find our author still believing that Herodotus visited Babylon. Aside from the gross error in his statement of the extent of the city, Herodotus shows so vague a knowledge of the interior of Asia, as contrasted with the vivid topographical details he gives of the coast lands, that personal inspection seems out of the question. The few facts he mentions would be just the ones which would most impress the casual traveler who must have been his informant.

King has followed the unfortunate precedent of writers on Assyria and Babylonia who dishearten their readers with a long, dry chapter on chronology before they reach the actual history. He defends himself by quoting the saying that chronology is the skeleton of history; but the average general reader prefers to have this skeleton hidden in the decent obscurity of a learned periodical. As this chapter most invites discussion, we may here investigate the subject in some detail.

The long-discussed Rim-Sin question is once more taken up. This is surprising in view of the recent discovery by Clay of a list of all the kings of the Larsa dynasty, in which Rim-Sin is given sixty-one years and is succeeded by Hammurapi, who is credited with twelve years, with perhaps the addition of a fraction. King has misunderstood this, and strangely thinks that the number is entirely doubtful. That the whole sixty-one years preceded Hammurapi is made additionally certain by the total given by the list. It was compiled in the twelfth year of Samsu-iluna, only twenty-four years after the fall of Rim-Sin, so that we cannot assume error, as if it were later. In spite of this authority, King argues that Rim-Sin spent a part of these sixty-one years as vassal in Larsa. This is flatly contradicted by evidence which cannot be explained away. For a good part of this period Rim-Sin could not possibly have ruled in Larsa, for that city was ruled by Sin-idinnam, so well known from the letters of Hammurapi. Equally certain is the evidence from the date lists. Clay has published¹ a list of dates, found at Larsa, giving the Babylonian year-names from the year when Hammurapi first defeated the Elamites to the year when it was composed, the seventh year of Samsu-iluna. Thus we have twenty-one years when they dated at Larsa, not by years of Rim-Sin, but by those of their Babylonian rulers. Add the thirty-two years of the Nisin era and the fifteen others collected by Chiera,² and we have a total of forty-seven which cannot have been used during the twenty-one years when Babylonian formulae were used. Thus, if we are to assume that Rim-Sin ruled Larsa in the ninth year of Samsu-iluna, he must have had at least sixty-eight different year formulae for his sixty-one years of reign. We come to the same conclusion if we examine the cases where the second year of the Nisin era is equated with the eighteenth or nineteenth of his reign, for that means sixteen years before the capture of Nisin, thirty-two of the era, and twenty-one or more under Babylonian dating—at the least sixty-six years. All the pertinent evidence flatly opposes the theory that Rim-Sin ruled Larsa as a vassal of Hammurapi.

There are, it must be admitted, two lines of evidence which throw a certain amount of doubt on the statements of the list. One is that in a late chronicle we are told that "Samsu-iluna [killed] Rim-Sin in the palace." This might be explained away did we not have other evidence in two documents, dealing with the same sale, one dated in the ninth year of Samsu-iluna, the other by Rim-Sin: that is, he turns up twenty-

¹ *Misc. Ins.*, no. 33.

² *Legal and Administrative Documents*, pp. 74 ff.

one years after his assumed deposition. His long reign indicates that he came to the throne at an early age, and this is confirmed by the fact that his father was still living and was for some time the real ruler, to judge from the inscriptions in which he is mentioned. Yet, even on the improbable supposition that he came to the throne at birth, Rim-Sin would have been eighty-two at this time. Nevertheless, it is not a difficult hypothesis to assume that Hammurapi had not wished to kill the already aged king, who lived on in obscurity until an attempt was made to build the city in his name, when at last Samsu-iluna put him to death. The statement of the chronicle, that he was killed in the palace, not in battle, seems to point to a judicial execution such as would be postulated on this theory.

Another problem is that of the relative date of the capture of Nisin. If the eighteenth and nineteenth years equated with the second year of the Nisin era are really years of reign, then there can be no doubt that Nisin was taken before the fall of Larsa and the accession of Hammurapi. Two arguments may be urged against this date. One is the length of lives which we must accept for certain individuals living at Nippur;¹ but the more this age question is studied, the less certain become its results.² The other is the doubt whether Rim-Sin would use the dating by years, so unusual at this time, for sixteen years, then for thirty-two use the Nisin era, and finally go back to the simple date formula. Both arguments have a large subjective element, and on the whole the evidence is in favor of the earlier date for the end of the Nisin dynasty.

Still another problem of chronology is connected with the dates of Marduk-nadin-akhe and Tiglath-pileser I. In common with other scholars, King seems not to have realized that we can prove that the great war between the two was later, not merely than the fifth, but than the tenth year of the Assyrian king; for, in his tablet 5, dated the tenth year, Tiglath-pileser still holds the Lower Zab as his southern boundary, whereas the first of the two expeditions listed by the Synchronistic History pushed the frontier to the south of that stream. The reference in the Broken Obelisk,³ which probably should be referred to year three, is clearly the first expedition of the Synchronistic History's lost source, for when that document adds to its first campaign "for the second time," it is obviously copying unintelligently a source it but partially excerpted. Thus we have three years of warfare between the two. The first would be in year three, not mentioned in the Cylinder because it is an Assyrian

¹ Chiera, pp. 19 ff.

² Cf. Clay, *Misc. Ins.*, p. 40, note.

³ I. 16.

defeat, and omitted from the Synchronistic History for the same reason, but given in the Broken Obelisk of Tiglath-pileser's son because it led up to the later capture of Babylon. It is, then, to the first of these campaigns, in year three, that we are to assign the carrying away of the gods of Ekallate, and the accession year of Tiglath-pileser I must be dated 1110 B.C.

In the fourth chapter we learn of the West Semites. Here King follows Huntington in assuming that to "climatic changes which seem . . . to occur in recurrent cycles, we may probably trace the great racial migration from Central Arabia." It is perfectly true that probability is in favor of a gradual drying up of the earth, and that climatic changes do seem to go in cycles; but, as has been pointed out elsewhere,¹ history cannot be interpreted in terms of changing climate until we have historical evidence of such changes. Such evidence, as set forth today by advocates of the theory, is, to put it mildly, of a highly unsatisfactory character. Recently Lammens, in his *Berceau de l'Islam*, has brought forward the strongest arguments to prove that the climate of Arabia has not essentially changed since the days of Muhammad, and Lybyer has added the weight of his knowledge of Muslim history to a denial of climatic influences in the great Muslim outpouring.² There may be something for the historian in the theory of climatic influences, but it must first be proved by the historical facts.

Brief but satisfactory sketches of early Palestine, Carchemish, and Hana are followed by a review of the Nisin and Larsa dynasties, a wise repetition since so much new information has come to light since the publication of *Sumer and Akkad*. In his study of Kish, King has not seen that, even with our present data, we can almost exactly date the various rulers. The city fell in the thirteenth year of Sumu-la-ilum and Halurim reigned at least two years, so that his accession is not later than year eleven. Iawium had at least five, which brings us back to year six, one year from year five, which we knew to have been included in his reign. Samsu-ditana, in whose West Semitic name we may see proof that he was a governor sent out from Babylon, reigned one year, and the five years' reign of Manana brings him to year fourteen of Sumu-abum, whereas he really ruled in year thirteen. Under Iawium there was seemingly a conquest of Uruk, and the date of that ruler might well lead us to connect the slaughter of Halamba in year three of Sumu-la-ilum with that city. In his tenth year, Hammurapi conquered Malgum,

¹ Olmstead, *Bulletin Amer. Geog. Soc.*, XLIV, 432 ff.; XLV, 439 ff.

² *Bibl. Sacra*, LXXIII, 156 ff.

which had been under his control six years before. The next year some lists give the credit of the conquest of Rabiquim to Ibiq-Adad, others to Hammurapi himself. King² has identified Ibiq-Adad with the Ibiq-Ishtar, king of Malgum, who appears elsewhere. It is better to assume that Ibiq-Ishtar revolted about year nine and that Ibiq-Adad took his place as subject king.

Proof is found that Hammurapi's "occupation of Assyria was of a permanent character" in a letter of that monarch² in which there is a reference to Ashur. That he had some sort of control of Ashur is proved by the Code, but we can hardly find such evidence in a letter sent from Babylon to Sin-idinna far in the south at Larsa, giving orders to send back soldiers whom he has, on the theory, just received from the Ashur far to the north. Langdon has pointed out an Ash-shu-ur^{ki} which seems to be in central Babylonia, and this fits the letter much better.³

If the most satisfactory portion of the book is not that on the Western Semites, then it is the one on the age of Hammurapi. Thanks to the Code, the letters, both public and private, and the numerous business documents, we know the period of the First Dynasty better than many a section of classical or mediaeval history. No two persons will agree as to what should be included and what the method of treatment should be, and it will suffice to say that here is a rich collection of valuable information. Still, just because of this, we could wish for a fuller treatment of social conditions and of the land system. That the two upper classes should be called nobles and middle class, respectively, is a little unfortunate. Even the term "gentry" for the former seems too narrow. At first it would include all freemen of the invading tribes, no matter how lowly; later some of the older nobility and the merchant class would be included. The *mushkenu* certainly did not represent our middle class; indeed, the term "serf" would not be far out of the way. The comparatively high position of the slave would tend to pull down the lower grade of laborers, especially the peasant cultivators. It is much to be wished that an exhaustive study of the land system should be made in the light of recent knowledge of that system of classical times and of the Middle Ages of which our system was in large measure the ancestor.

The history is then continued with the gradual breakdown of the First Dynasty, and the scanty data are well interpreted. King is undoubtedly correct in explaining the reign of Samsu-iluna as a period of rapid decline, though Rogers takes the date formulae at face value

¹ *Chron.*, p. 169, note.

² *Letters*, 37, 23.

³ Langdon, *Lectures*, p. 169; cf. *CT*, VI, 19.

and makes it "indeed a great reign." There can be no doubt that Iluma-ilu, the founder of the Second Dynasty, held Nippur after the twenty-ninth year of Samsu-iluna, but one can hardly follow Chiera¹ in making the Iluma-ilu tablets found there indicate an invasion close to the eighteenth year of the Babylonian. It is true that dating it after the twenty-ninth year makes some of the individuals somewhat long-lived, but, as we have seen in the case of Rim-Sin, such arguments are rather precarious. There is, however, a question which King seems not to have recognized. If the Iluma-ilu tablets from Nippur are after the twenty-ninth year, then King has no right to connect the events of the twentieth year with Iluma-ilu, for the tablets are dated "Year after Iluma-ilu became king," that is, he became king in the twenty-eighth year of Samsu-iluna. If we accept the dates of Kugler for the First Dynasty, then the Second began about 2053.

The chronological difficulties in the way of accepting the dates of the king list become impossibilities if with King we accept the theory that the Damiq-ilishu whose Nisin wall was destroyed by Ammi-ditana was the third king of the Second Dynasty. To be sure, this identification is hardly so sure as King would believe, for the Damiq-ilishu who was the last king of the Nisin dynasty did build the great city wall and used the event in at least two date formulae, and even the fact that he was a good bit earlier can hardly offset the fact that we know nothing of any wall-building by the other. Assuming, however, that King really is correct, we have, according to the list, to squeeze the sixty years of Iluma-ilu, the fifty-five of Itti-ili-nibi, and some or all of the thirty-six of Damiq-ilishu—that is, from 115 to 151 years—into the seventy-four which elapsed from the accession of Iluma-ilu to the thirty-sixth of Ammi-ditana.

In connection with the dynasty which we find at Uruk about the end of the First Dynasty we should note the exhaustive study of the inscriptions of Sin-gashid by Duncan.² Many of these are now scattered over the country: for example, tablets and cones are found at the Bible College, Columbia, Missouri, and the State Normal School, Kirksville, Missouri. Note also the interesting inscriptions of Anam in Clay's new volume.³ In none of these does Anam call himself king, though but one mentions an overlord, Sin-gamil, and a date formula gives the royal accession year. Clearly we have a hitherto unrecognized case of gradual

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 66 f.

² *Amer. Jour. Semit. Lang.*, XXXI, 215 ff.

³ *Misc. Ins.*, no. 35 f.

usurpation by a high official. The new inscriptions deal with the restoration of the temple of Innina, constructed by Ur-Engur and Dungi, but recently burned, perhaps in a war with the sea land kings, whose issue demonstrated that Anam should thrust aside his powerless overlord and himself take the crown.

In his chapter on the Kashshites, King introduces a good sketch of the recent excavations at the Hittite capital. Then follow the letters to and from the Egyptian and Hittite kings. Though there are certain advantages in dealing with the letters as a whole, it makes very difficult a general view of this only too difficult period of history.

In the case of Agum-kak-rime, King is no doubt correct in connecting the Hani from which that ruler brought back the statues of Marduk and his consort with the Hana of the Middle Euphrates Valley, rather than with the place of the same name on the Persian border.¹ We may well ask, however, whether with King we should say Hani-rabbat, Hana the great, or whether we should not rather read Hani-Galbat, and connect it with the Galbatha which Isidore of Charax knew as a deserted village on the Euphrates four hours below Nicephorium. It is true that Galbatha is rather far north for the capital of Hana, Tirqa, which is to be located at 'Ishārah.² Curiously enough, the document which proves it here is from a certain Zim, the son of Ish, who rules as king of Mari; in other words, Hana is the later representative of Mari. That this is actually the site of the most important city in the middle Euphrates region in early times is further confirmed by a neat case of dovetailing. In apparent ignorance of the recent discovery of Herzfeld, Clay³ has identified Mari with the Merrha of the Parthian Stations of Isidore of Charax, and Isidore locates Merrha, as exactly as one can locate on the hour basis, at 'Ishārah.

In the very difficult history of the later Kashshite kings, we note that King regularly follows the Assyrian Synchronistic History, while Rogers as regularly follows the Babylonian Chronicle P. Either reconstruction has its difficulties, and in the present state of our knowledge we can only say that the Synchronistic History is undoubtedly untrustworthy in important cases, and the Chronicle seems about as bad.

With the Assyrian period King loses interest, and the entire period is covered in twenty pages. Thus a great opportunity has been lost. The one exception to the provincial form of government which the

¹ Rogers, *History*, II, 106.

² Herzfeld, *Rev. Assyr.*, XI, 134 ff.

³ *Misc. Ins.*, p. 4.

Assyrians first developed is found in their treatment of Babylon. They looked upon the older culture land as the Romans looked upon the Greeks. Since sentiment would not permit Babylon to be reduced to the form of a province, and since it was most inconvenient for a militant Assyrian king to seize the hands of Bel-Marduk in the city each New Year's Day, Babylon remained an anomaly whose unique position can be studied only as a whole, in the various attempts of the rulers to fit this anomaly into the rounded provincial organization. So rapid is King's survey that we have but the barest outline of the facts, and there is little basis for criticism. Can we deny to Sargon the title of king of Babylon when he seized the hands of Bel, resided in the city, was included in the lists, and had business documents dated by the years of his rule? Ashur-bani-apal did not conduct, either in person or by deputy, those Egyptian expeditions the record of which many an American student has made his first exercise in cuneiform. If we examine the earliest documents for his reign and then trace the process of re-editing, we find that in edition after edition he has taken more from his father's campaigns in the west, until all are stolen for his own greater glory.

If King can excuse himself for his twenty pages on the Assyrian period because of his intention to deal with it in his third volume, what shall we say of a *History of Babylon* which devotes but ten pages to the Chaldaean dynasty which gave the city its undying fame? Even taking into consideration the earlier chapter on the topography and architecture, there is far too little on the man who put an end to Hebrew nationality. Rogers, in a more general survey of Babylonia and Assyria, finds almost a hundred pages needful for a proper discussion of the period.

In conclusion, we expect a survey of the culture of the later period, corresponding to that on the time of Hammurapi. We now have a mass of material on the non-political history and, in spite of the phrase "unchanging East," a careful study would show many respects in which the Hammurapi culture had become antiquated. In place of this, King offers a criticism of the German theory of Pan-Babylonianism. With his general point of view most American scholars will be in hearty agreement; but why in a general history discuss so elaborately a theory which already has gone far toward itself becoming a part of the history of past error?

In a review of this type, it is natural that matters of disagreement should bulk large, and it is not the desire of the reviewer to deny the solid virtues of the book. At the same time, when compared with works of similar character in other fields of history, there is an obvious lack of

unity and of the historical point of view. It is probably not without its significance that King has spent his life publishing texts while Rogers, who has produced a book so much more in line with modern historical methods, has confined himself almost exclusively to the study of history. It is an axiom of long standing that rarely do we have a genius so great as to be great both as a philologist and as a historian.

A. T. OLMSTEAD

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

THE BABYLONIAN AND THE HEBREW LAWS

Before publishing his Schweich Lectures for 1912, Dr. Johns apparently took some time to edit his lectures and to compile an extensive bibliography which is appended to the volume.¹

One opens the book with expectation, since Dr. Johns was one of the first translators of the Code of Hammurapi, and has for years specialized in the contract literature of Babylonia, but one lays it down with something of disappointment. Of course in three brief lectures no exhaustive comparison of the long Babylonian code and the laws of the Pentateuch was possible; only a few salient points could be dealt with. In the brief compass allowed the author naturally deals with those points of the two legislations that most readily invite comparison and contrast—questions of the organization of society in the two countries, temporary slavery incurred in consequence of debt, the treatment of an ox who gores a man, etc. In the course of his exposition Dr. Johns often directs his telling shafts of criticism against those who have made extravagant claims for the influence of the Babylonian code. For this work he merits our gratitude, for his rapier pricks many a bubble.

Dr. Johns recognizes, as every student of these legislations does, that there is a considerable element common to the two bodies of laws. For example, the punishments in both are based in a good degree upon the *lex talionis*. The attitude of the author as to the cause of these likenesses is of peculiar interest. It has been clear to his colleagues ever since Dr. Johns wrote the introduction to Jeremias' *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient Orient* that he has a leaning toward Pan-Babylonianism. That leaning is apparent in this discussion. He remarks on p. 53: "A common Semitic origin may really be only a step toward a reference of

¹ *The Relation between the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples*. By Rev. C. H. W. Johns, M.A., Litt.D., Master of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge. London: Published by the British Academy, 1914. xvi+96 pages. 3s.